HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

S.B. : HON'BLE SHRI SATISH K. AGNIHOTRI, J.

WRIT PETITION (S) No. 2212 of 2007

PETITIONER : Set Ram Saw, S/o Shri Dhani Ram Saw, Aged about 45 years, Assistant Teacher Govt. Higher Secondary School Kodatarai Block-Pussore, Distt. Raigarh [C.G.]

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS : 1. State of Chhattisgarh Through: Secretary Education Department, D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur (C.G.)

2. District Education Officer Distt. Raigarh [C.G.]

3. Block Education Officer Block Pussore Distt. Raigarh [C.G.]

Present: Shri Sanjay Patel, Advocate for the petitioner.
Shri Arvind Dubey, Panel Lawyer for the State / respondents.

ORDER
(Passed on 10th of April, 2007)

1. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner as well as for the State/respondents jointly submit that the fact and question of law involved in the present writ petition are the same to that of in **Yashwant Kumar Bharadwaj Vs. Municipal Corporation, Durg and another {2006 (II) MPJR-CG 96}**, which has been disposed of vide order dated 03.04.2006. Learned counsel appearing for the respondents does not controvert the said submission.

(25)

2. In subsequent cases, i.e., Writ Petition (S.) No.4130 of 2005 (***Gopesh Kumar Verma*** **vs.** ***The State Govt. of Chhattisgarh and another***) and other connected matters, decided by this Court on 15-12-2006, pursuant to the memo dated 28-1-1995, issued by the Secretary, Board of Secondary Education, Bhopal and the prospectus of Diploma in Education Examination, it was clarified that the nomenclature of the Basic Training Institute, i.e., B.T.I. has been changed and renamed as Diploma in Education, i.e., D.Ed. Accordingly, the D.Ed. Certificate holders are also covered by the decision in Writ Petition (S.) No.4130 of 2005 (***Gopesh Kumar Verma*** **vs.** ***The State Govt. of Chhattisgarh and another***) (Supra).

3. Accordingly, the writ petition is allowed in terms of the order passed in the case of **Yashwant Kumar Bharadwaj Vs. Municipal Corporation, Durg and another** (Supra), subject to verification of the fact as to whether the petitioners have acquired D.Ed. Examination Certificate on his own expenses as per the circulars dated 24.12.1998 and 01.03.1999 and further whether he has been paid two advance increments or not. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Amit